

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## **United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE

08/913,518

11/04/97

DEBALME

J

1247-709-3VF

IM62/0604

OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT CRYSTAL SQUARE FIVE 1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY FOURTH FLOOR ARLINGTON VA 22202

**EXAMINER** 

AFTERGUT, J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1733

DATE MAILED:

06/04/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	08/913,518	DEBALME ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeff H. Aftergut	1733	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe		orrespondence ad	dress
THE REPLY FILED 20 May 2001 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application in the same of th	ation. A proper re th places the appl	eply to a ication in
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check only a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the proposed reply (within two reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR of whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period mailing date of the final rejection.	o months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (ontinues to run from the mailing date of the	final rejection,	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three movement patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the t I statutory period for reply originally set in the	fee. The appropriate e ne final Office action; o	xtension fee under or (2) as set forth in
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>29 May 2001</u>. App 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37CFF</li> </ol>			rth in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon with requisite fees.	the timely submission of a Notic	e of Appeal and	Appeal Brief
3. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) $oxed{oxed}$ they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search. (	see NOTE below)	);
(b) $\ \square$ they raise the issue of new matter. (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected cla	ims.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
4. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
5. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely file	ed amendment
6. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does N	OT place the
7. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which w	ere newly
8. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s)	is as follows (see attached writte	n explanation, if a	any):
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 5-14.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
9. $\square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on $\_\_\_$ a	ı)∏has b)∏ has not been appr	oved by the Exan	niner.
10. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
11. ☐ Other:	(	Jeff/H. Aftergut ( Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1733	mt .





Continuation of 3. NOTE: The applicant has proposed to amend the claims to recite the step of providing the layers of material followed by the step of depositing the layers of material which would appear to require the provision of preformed layers (in the proposed claim) as opposed to the mere deposition of the layers upon the conveyor (which does not require the provision of preformed layers). As such, the proposed amendment appears to add a new issue which would require further consideration.